



Phillips Lytle LLP

1761
1FW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

June 23, 2005

Re: U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/834,253; filed 04/12/01; for CO-
EXTRUDED CHEESE SNACKS

Gentlemen:

Applicant respectfully inquires as to the status of the subject application.

Applicant sent a status inquiry letter (copy attached) on February 24, 2005 and has not received a response.

Accordingly, applicant would inquire as to the status of the subject application.

Very truly yours,

PHILLIPS LYTLE LLP

By Michael J. Berchou
Michael J. Berchou, Esq.
Reg. No. 48,233

MJB2pi
Enclosure
BFLO Doc. # 1493107.1

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

MICHAEL J. BERCHOU, PARTNER DIRECT 716 847 7078 MBERCHOU@PHILLIPSLYTLE.COM

3400 HSBC CENTER BUFFALO, NY 14203-2887 PHONE 716 847 8400 FAX 716 852 6100
BUFFALO ALBANY CHAUTAUQUA GARDEN CITY NEW YORK ROCHESTER WWW.PHILLIPSLYTLE.COM



Phillips Lytle LLP

Via Express Mail

February 24, 2005

Mail Stop Designations
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Re: U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/834,253; filed 04/12/01;
for CO-EXTRUDED CHEESE SNACKS

Gentlemen:

Applicant respectfully inquires as to the status of the subject application.

C
O
P
Y
We filed an amendment in this case on March 18, 2004 after a telephone interview with the Primary Examiner, Leslie Wong, on February 17, 2005. We have not received a copy of the Interview Summary. During that interview, the Examiner instructed the Applicant to amend the independent claims, Claims 1 and 16, to include a temporal limitation with respect to the flow of the core from the cheese product and the migration of water from the core to the outer layer, and agreed that such an amendment would place the claims in condition for allowance. A corresponding amendment was made on March 18, 2004.

On July 26, 2004, the Examiner issued a final office action, again rejecting all claims without addressing the amendment. However, we contacted the Examiner on August 26, 2004 at which time the Examiner acknowledged that the July 26, 2004 office action may have been issued in error as the Applicant's prior amendment (filed September 9, 2003) was attached to the February interview summary. As a result, the Examiner acknowledged that she may have inadvertently issued the July 26, 2004 office action in response to the September 9, 2003 amendment, rather than the March 18, 2004 amendment.

We again contacted the Examiner on October 7, 2004. At that time, the Examiner stated that a supplemental office action would be issued and that Applicant's time to respond to the July 26, 2004 office action would be restarted. The Examiner confirmed this in an Interview Summary, mailed on November 16, 2004, which states: "A new action will be issued restarting the time period."

Michael J. Berchou
716 847-7078
mberchou@phillipslytle.com

ATTORNEYS AT LAW



Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Page 2

February 24, 2005

We have made several attempts to contact the Examiner by telephone since that time, but have not received any response. Accordingly, Applicant would inquire as to the status of the subject application.

Very truly yours,

Phillips Lytle LLP

By /s/

Michael J. Berchou

MJB2/sdo
BFLO Doc. # 1462400.2

cc: Primary Examiner, Leslie Wong (Via Fax 703-872-9306)
Supervisor, Milton Cano (Via Fax 703-872-9306)

C

O

P

Y